



Tennessee Teacher Equity Plan

*to ensure that poor or minority children
are taught by effective teachers at the
same or higher rate as other children*

December 2009

For more information, please contact:
Merrie M. Clark, Ed.D.
Data and Research Manager
Office of Federal Programs
Tennessee Department of Education
(615) 741-0202
merrie.clark@tn.gov

Teacher Equity Plan 2009-2010

The Tennessee Teacher Equity Plan was designed in 2006 to ensure that poor or minority students are taught by effective teachers at the same or higher rates as other students. The plan was updated for the school year 2009-2010. The updated plan compares data on highly qualified teachers, teachers' years of experience, and teacher effectiveness in high poverty and low poverty public schools across the state. A summary of the findings include the following: 1) the percentage of highly qualified teachers has increased significantly since the 2006 plan with the gap in the percentage of HQTs between high poverty and low poverty schools eliminated (elementary level) or nearly eliminated (secondary level); 2) high poverty schools, high minority schools, and high poverty/high minority schools have a larger percentage of inexperienced teachers (five years of experience or less) than low poverty, low minority, and low poverty/low minority schools; and 3) high poverty schools have a larger percentage of ineffective teachers and a smaller percentage of highly effective teachers than low poverty schools when comparing combined math, science, and reading/language arts teacher effect scores. However, when looking at the separate teacher effect scores, for reading/language arts, high poverty schools have more ineffective teachers and fewer highly effective teachers than low poverty schools. For math and science, the percentages of ineffective teachers in high poverty and low poverty schools are similar but large, indicating a need to improve the quality of math and science teachers across Tennessee. Additionally, for science, high poverty schools have a much smaller percentage of highly effective teachers than low poverty schools, suggesting that students in high poverty schools may not have access to the most effective science teachers.

The 2009-2010 Teacher Equity Plan begins by providing background on the teacher equity issue in Tennessee, including challenges, strategies, and progress. Next, the plan examines inequities in teacher assignment through analyses and discussion of the distribution of highly qualified teachers, teachers' years of experience, and teacher effectiveness across high poverty and low poverty schools. The plan then presents strategies that will be implemented to ensure the equitable distribution of highly qualified, highly effective teachers in schools.¹

Background

In summer 2006, the U.S. Department of Education required states to submit highly qualified teacher (HQT) state plans that included an equity plan to ensure "that poor and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers." The Tennessee plan contained a comprehensive analysis of the equitable distribution of HQTs across the state as well as an analysis of teacher experience and education levels by

¹ The plan will be revised in January 2010 to include updates on the progress of the six districts, Hamilton County, Knox County, Madison County, Memphis City, Metropolitan Nashville, and Shelby County, identified in the 2006 plan as those with the most significant teacher equity gaps.

school poverty and minority status.² The analyses found that high poverty and high minority schools had a larger percentage of beginning teachers, a smaller percentage of teachers with master's degrees, and a lower percentage of core academic courses taught by HQTs than low poverty and low minority schools.

The 2006 plan also identified six districts with the greatest equity gaps, detailed strategies to address these gaps, and outlined steps the state would take to monitor implementation of teacher equity plans in these districts. The importance of identifying and providing technical assistance and support to the six districts to improve equity in the distribution of highly qualified and highly effective teachers cannot be overstated as these districts serve over half of Tennessee's public school population. The six districts will share the results of their teacher equity implementation plans with other districts so that successful strategies can be replicated across the state.

The Tennessee Department of Education partnered with the Appalachia Regional Comprehensive Center (ARCC), which drew on the resources and expertise of the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (NCCTQ), to provide technical assistance to the six districts with the greatest equity gaps. A description of the work is found in the NCCTQ 2009 publication *America's Opportunity: Teacher Effectiveness and Equity in K-12 Classrooms*, Carr, D. & Oxnam, G. "Addressing the Equitable Distribution of Teachers in Tennessee (p. 100-109)."

In the 2006 equity plan, Tennessee committed to take its study one crucial step further by examining the disparity in teacher effectiveness, as measured by student progress on statewide achievement assessments. Based on research conducted in 2007, the state concluded that a clear equity problem existed. Students in high poverty, high-minority schools had less access to the state's most effective teachers and more access to the state's least effective teachers than students in low poverty, low minority schools (*Tennessee's Most Effective Teachers: Are They Assigned to the Schools That Need Them the Most*)³.

During the 2007 legislative session, the Tennessee Code (Section 49-1-602d) was amended to include Sections 5 and 6, which address HQTs in hard-to-staff schools and subjects. Under the statute, each district is required to develop a differentiated pay plan that addresses teaching in hard-to-staff subject areas or in schools that have difficulty hiring and retaining HQTs. The statute grants the Tennessee Department of Education authority to approve the district plans.

Research studies have found that teachers influence student learning more than any other factor in school (Barber & Mourshed, 2007; Goldhaber et al., 1999; Rivkin *et al.*, 2005; Rockoff, 2004, as cited by Behrstock & Clifford, 2009, for NCCTQ) and that the effect of teachers on student achievement is cumulative; according to Sanders & Rivers, 1996 (as cited by Behrstock & Clifford, 2009), having even just a few ineffective teachers can have detrimental long-term consequences for the students affected. Likewise, having effective teachers positively impacts student achievement significantly. This research fuels Tennessee's steadfast commitment to identifying and providing highly effective teachers in all classrooms.

² Teacher education levels were not examined in the 2009-2010 report due to the lack of research to support degree level as an indicator of teacher quality. In fact, research compiled by Laura Goe and Leslie M. Stickler for the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (2008) showed that empirical studies were not finding a substantial benefit for students of teachers with advanced degrees (Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2006; Monk, 1994; Rowan, Correnti, & Miller, 2002; Betts, Zau, and Rice (2003).

³ This document may be viewed at http://state.tn.us/education/nclb/doc/TeacherEffectiveness2007_03.pdf

A. Inequities in Teacher Assignment

Highly Qualified

As Table 1 shows, the percentage of highly qualified teachers increased from 80.9% to 98.8% across all Tennessee schools between 2004-2005 and 2008-2009. Moreover, the percentage of highly qualified teachers was nearly the same in high poverty and low poverty schools in 2008-2009. At the elementary level, the percentage of highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools (99.4) slightly exceeded that of low poverty schools (99.3). At the secondary level, the gap between high poverty (97.7%) and low poverty (98.2%) schools narrowed to less than one percentage point (0.5) in 2008-2009 from over 10 percentage points (10.3) in 2004-2005. Changes in hiring practices, better data systems to monitor and report teacher quality, and increased SEA and federal support to districts along with other factors contributed to the improvement.

TABLE 1
Statewide Percentage of Core Academic Courses Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
For School Years 2004-2005 and 2008-2009
Disaggregated by High Poverty vs. Low Poverty Schools in Tennessee
(Consolidated State Performance Report, Part I, 2009)

School Type	Percentage of Core Academic Courses Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers 2004-2005	Percentage of Core Academic Courses Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers 2008-2009
All Schools in the State	80.9	98.8
Elementary Level (Grades K – 6)		
High Poverty Schools	81.3	99.4
Low Poverty Schools	87.9	99.3
Gap Between High Poverty and Low Poverty Elementary Schools	6.6	No gap -0.1
Secondary Level (Grades 7-12)		
High Poverty Schools	71.0	97.7
Low Poverty Schools	81.3	98.2
Gap Between High Poverty and Low Poverty Secondary Schools	10.3	0.5

The 2009 Free and Reduced Price Lunch data for each school are used to rank all schools statewide. The top and bottom quartiles of this distribution are then determined; the top quartile is assigned High Poverty, and the bottom quartile is assigned Low Poverty.

Teacher Experience

To develop policies that could eliminate the inequity in the distribution of highly effective teachers, policymakers and educators need to know more about how high poverty and high minority schools differ in their ability to retain and attract effective teachers throughout their careers. The analyses in Tennessee's 2006 Teacher Equity Plan and in numerous other studies show that high poverty and high minority schools have a disproportionate number of beginning teachers. Data for 2008-09 confirm this relationship.

Tables 2, 3, and 4 (on the next page) examine teacher experience at the school level by poverty, minority, and poverty/minority status, respectively. For these analyses, teachers were categorized into three experience levels: novice (0-2 years), inexperienced (3-5 years), and experienced (6 or more years). Table 2 reveals that high poverty schools had larger percentages of novice and inexperienced teachers (31.6%) than low poverty schools (25.0%). In other words, there was a 6.6 percentage point gap between high poverty and low poverty schools in the distribution of teachers by experience. In Tennessee, the schools that generally struggle the most with student achievement have high numbers of economically disadvantaged students, yet these are the same schools that have the highest percentage of inexperienced teachers.

Table 3 and Table 4 (next page) indicate that the inequitable distribution of novice and inexperienced teachers was an even greater concern in high minority and high poverty/high minority schools than in high poverty schools. The gap in the distribution of novice and inexperienced teachers was 12.1 percentage points when comparing high minority (33.8%) to low minority schools (21.7%) and 11.4 percentage points when comparing high minority/high poverty (33.4%) to low minority/low poverty schools (22.0%).

These findings may relate in part to Tennessee's alternative licensure programs, which tend to be located in high poverty, high minority schools in urban areas. These urban districts also have a higher percentage of minority students compared with rural and suburban districts. Many of the individuals holding an alternative license may be second career professionals who have an advanced degree but not teaching preparation and experience.

Teacher Effectiveness

It is important to study the distribution of teacher effectiveness across schools. In Tennessee, students in poverty are less likely to be meeting grade-level standards than other students. While they make about the same rate of academic progress each year as other students, they are more likely to start out below grade level. Consequently, they need effective teachers – teachers who have the ability to accelerate their rate of academic progress – to reach grade level expectations and beyond.

The Distribution of Teachers* by Experience Level For the 2008-2009 School Year

**TABLE 2
By Poverty Level**

Poverty Levels	Teacher Years Experience		
	0-2 (Novice)	3-5 (Inexperienced)	6 + (Experienced)
High Poverty	15.5	16.1	68.4
Low Poverty	8.9	16.1	75.0
Middle Poverty	9.9	15.8	74.3

The 2009 Free and Reduced Price Lunch data for each school are used to rank all schools statewide. The top and bottom quartiles of this distribution are then determined; the top quartile is assigned High Poverty, and the bottom quartile is assigned Low Poverty.

**TABLE 3
by Minority Level**

Poverty Levels	Teacher Years Experience		
	0-2 (Novice)	3-5 (Inexperienced)	6+ (Experienced)
High Minority	16.3	17.5	66.2
Low Minority	8.0	13.7	78.3
Middle	9.4	16.3	74.3

The 2009 percent minority for each school are used to rank all schools statewide. The top and bottom quartiles of this distribution are then determined; the top quartile is assigned High Minority, and the bottom quartile is assigned Low Minority.

**TABLE 4
By Poverty/Minority Level**

Poverty Levels	Teacher Years Experience		
	0-2 (Novice)	3-5 (Inexperienced)	6+ (Experienced)
High Poverty/High Minority	16.9	16.5	66.6
Low Poverty/Low Minority	7.0	15.0	78.0
Other	9.8	15.9	74.3

High Poverty/High Minority schools are defined as schools that are in the top quartile for both poverty and minority. Low Poverty/Low Minority schools are defined as schools that are in the bottom quartile for both poverty and minority.

*Includes all teachers in grades 4-8 who had a teacher effect for an end of grade TCAP subject and all high school teachers who had a teacher effect for a Gateway or End of Course high school subject.
(SAS Institute Inc., 12/15/2009)

This 2009-10 teacher equity report includes teacher effectiveness analyses using statewide teacher effect scores for school year 2008-09. Tennessee is uniquely positioned to carry out these analyses. For more than 16 years, the state has been harnessing its longitudinal student assessment database – which includes links between students and their teachers. A teacher’s effect score (value-added estimate) is an indicator of how much the teacher influences his or her students’ academic progress. A teacher effect score below zero indicates that the average student in the teacher’s class made less progress than the state growth standard, while a teacher effect score above zero indicates that the average student in the teacher’s class made more progress than the state growth standard. All teacher effect scores include a standard error, which is a measure of the uncertainty around the score. For the purposes of this study, teachers were divided into one of four categories based on their teacher effect scores: “Highly Effective” (Level 4 or Level 5), “Average Effectiveness” (Level 3), “Approaching Average Effectiveness” (Level 2), and “Ineffective (Level 1).”*

***Rules for Level determination**

The 2008-2009 teacher gain relative to the 2008-2009 state gain is the teacher effect. The teacher effect (that is, teacher gain –state gain) is divided by its standard error to form a *t*-value for each teacher-grade-subject.

- Level Five: The teacher *t*-value is 2 or greater.
- Level Four: The teacher *t*-value is greater than 1 but less than 2.
- Level Three: The teacher *t*-value is greater than -1 but less than +1.
- Level Two: The teacher *t*-value is greater than -2 but less than -1.
- Level One: The teacher *t*-value is less than -2.

(SAS Institute Inc., 12/17/ 2009)

The next four tables (Tables 5-8) use 2008-2009 teacher effectiveness data to give insight into the distribution of effective teachers across schools with varying poverty levels. Table 5 (next page) data are based on teacher effect scores for reading/language arts (End of Grade TCAP Reading/Language Arts for grades 4-8 and End of Course English I and Gateway English II for high school). The percentage (14.9%) of ineffective teachers (Level 1) in high poverty schools is more than double the percentage (6.5%) of ineffective teachers (Level 1) in low poverty schools. Of equal concern is that the percentage of highly effective reading/language arts teachers (Levels 4, 5) is 12 percentage points lower in high poverty schools (16.2%) than in low poverty schools (28.2%).

TABLE 5
Teacher Effectiveness Summary for Reading/Language Arts

Table of Teacher Rating by Poverty Category			
Teacher Rating	Poverty Category		
	High Poverty	Low Poverty	Middle
Highly Effective (Level 4,5)	16.2	28.2	22.2
Average Effectiveness (Level 3)	50.9	53.2	58.2
Approaching Average Effectiveness (Level 2)	18.0	12.1	12.5
Ineffective (Level 1)	14.9	6.5	7.1

The 2009 Free and Reduced Price Lunch data for each school are used to rank all schools statewide. The top and bottom quartiles of this distribution are then determined; the top quartile is assigned High Poverty and the bottom quartile is assigned Low Poverty

(SAS Institute Inc., 12/17/2009)

Table 6 data are based on teacher effect scores for mathematics (End of Grade TCAP Math for grades 4-8 and Gateway Algebra I for high school). The data here paint a much different picture than the data in Table 5. While there is approximately a four percentage point gap in the share of highly effective teachers (Levels 4 & 5) in high poverty (34.9%) as compared to low poverty schools (38.8%), the percentage of ineffective teachers (Level 1) is nearly the same in high poverty (16.6%) and low poverty schools (16.2%). The major concern here is the high percentage of ineffective math teachers (Level 1) across all schools. The percentage of ineffective math teachers is highest (22.5 %) in middle poverty schools. These data suggest that Tennessee has much work to do to improve the quality of teaching in mathematics across the state.

TABLE 6
Teacher Effectiveness Summary for Mathematics

Table of Teacher Rating by Poverty Category			
Teacher Rating	Poverty Category		
	High Poverty	Low Poverty	Middle
Highly Effective (Level 4,5)	34.9	38.8	30.8
Average Effectiveness (Level 3)	37.6	33.7	32.3
Approaching Average Effectiveness (Level 2)	10.9	11.3	14.4
Ineffective (Level 1)	16.6	16.2	22.5

(SAS Institute Inc., 12/17/2009)

Table 7 data are based on teacher effect scores for science (End of Grade TCAP Science for grades 4-8 and Gateway Biology I for high school). The percentage of ineffective teachers (Level 1) is actually lower in high poverty schools (15.1%) than in low poverty schools (16.4%). However, the percentage of highly effective science teachers (Levels 4, 5) in high poverty schools (20.7%) is roughly half that of low poverty schools (38.0%). These data suggest that students in high poverty schools do not have access to the most effective science teachers. As with math, the high percentage of ineffective science teachers indicates that Tennessee has much work to do to improve the quality of teaching in science across the state.

TABLE 7
Teacher Effectiveness Summary for Science

Table of Teacher Rating by Poverty Category			
Teacher Rating	Poverty Category		
	High Poverty	Low Poverty	Middle
Highly Effective (Level 4,5)	20.7	38.0	30.3
Average Effectiveness (Level 3)	45.2	35.0	34.9
Approaching Average Effectiveness - (Level 2)	19.0	10.6	15.6
Ineffective (Level 1)	15.1	16.4	19.2

(SAS Institute Inc., 12/17/2009)

Table 8 combines teacher effect data for all three subjects, reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. The combined data reveal that the percentage of highly effective teachers (Levels 4, 5) is nearly 11 percentage points lower in high poverty schools (23.4%) than in low poverty schools (34.2%). The discrepancy in the distribution of ineffective teachers is significantly smaller at roughly three percentage points (15.5% in high poverty schools as compared to 12.2% in low poverty schools). Overall, the majority of teachers fall in the approaching average effectiveness (Level 2) and average effectiveness (Level 3) categories regardless of school poverty status. Once again the data indicate the need for strong professional development for all teachers and an emphasis on improved teacher recruitment.

TABLE 8
Teacher Effectiveness Summary for All Subjects

Table of Teacher Rating by Poverty Category			
Teacher Rating	Poverty Category		
	High Poverty	Low Poverty	Middle
Highly Effective (Level 4,5)	23.4	34.2	27.1
Average Effectiveness (Level 3)	45.0	42.2	43.7
Approaching Average Effectiveness - (Level 2)	16.1	11.4	13.9
Ineffective (Level 1)	15.5	12.2	15.3

(SAS Institute Inc., 12/17/2009)

B. Specific Strategies for Addressing Inequities in Teacher Assignment

Goal: To ensure the equitable distribution of teachers in high poverty schools by developing a plan to ensure that students in high poverty schools have equitable access to highly qualified, highly effective teachers and are not served by unqualified, ineffective teachers at higher rates than other students.

Measurements:

- Percentage of highly-qualified teachers in high poverty from TDE/district data files
- Percentage of highly-effective teachers in high poverty from TVAAS teacher effect scores
- Workplace perceptions from teacher working conditions survey results
- Equitable distribution of school-level per pupil expenditures from state and local funds as measured by the USDOE Study of School-level Expenditures

Tennessee will continue (and scale up) two statewide strategies for addressing inequities in teacher assignment that were included in the 2006 Equity Plan.

Strategy 1: Continuous analysis, dissemination, and training on the use of data relevant to increasing the percentage of highly-effective teachers and improving the distribution of highly effective teachers in high poverty schools.

Recipients	Activities	Responsibility	Timeline
Teachers/Principals Districts/State	Teacher and district/school training on the interpretation of electronic score reports	SEA/LEA	2010-11; annually
	Teacher Effect Scores reported electronically to teachers, principals, and districts	SEA	2010-11; annually
	Electronic dashboard provided to analyze student data for interventions	SEA/LEA	2010-11; annually
	Individualized teacher and administrative professional development linked to diagnostic component on teacher effect score reports	LEA/Schools	2011-12; ongoing
	Data are used to guide strategies to improve classroom instruction and increase student achievement; plans for individual and school improvement are implemented and monitored.	LEA/Schools	2010-11; ongoing

Recipients	Activities	Responsibility	Timeline
Teachers/Principals Districts/State	Teacher working conditions survey administered state-wide; results analyzed, disseminated, and used to plan improvements in the recruitment, assignment, retention, and development of highly-qualified, highly effective teachers	SEA/LEA	2010-11; annually
	School and district level reports on teacher distribution are provided.	SEA/LEA	2010-2011; annually
	School and district administrators are trained to interpret and use teacher distribution reports.	SEA/LEA/Schools	2010-2011; annually
	District administrators use teacher distribution data to plan district/school intervention strategies and evaluate their effectiveness.	LEA	2010-2011; annually
	School-level per pupil salary expenditure data are used to examine the extent to which school-level resources are distributed equally within their districts; plans to address identified inequities are developed and implemented.	LEA	2010-2011; annually
	Principal assignments are evaluated in light of AYP results, school value-added, and working conditions survey results	LEA	2011-2012; annually
	Principal evaluations include student academic growth measures and working conditions survey results	LEA	2012-2013; annually
	Teacher evaluations include the use of teacher effect data	LEA/Schools	2012-2013; annually
	Teacher induction programs and new teacher mentoring programs reflect activities to strengthen teacher effectiveness	LEA/Schools	2011-2012; annually
	Districts are trained and provided resources to conduct a human resources alignment assessment to determine the degree to which programs, policies, and requirements support the equitable distribution of highly qualified, highly effective teachers and strategies to increase teacher effectiveness overall.	SEA/LEA	2010-2011; annually

These analyses will be disseminated through the following:

- The State's Website
- Electronic and face-to-face meetings with LEAs
- Reports to the State Board of Education

Strategy 2: The Tennessee Department of Education will continue partnering with the Appalachia Regional Comprehensive Center (ARCC) and utilize resources from the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (NCCTQ) to provide technical assistance to districts in choosing and implementing specific policies and practices to address inequities in teacher assignment. The technical assistance will be provided through Web meetings with LEAs, Webpages with links to promising strategies, and individual or group meetings with districts. These policies and practices may include topics, such as:

- Financial incentives such as performance pay, alternative compensation, and salary increases*
- Working conditions*
- Mentoring and induction programs*
- Hiring and transfer practices*
- Resource allocation and distribution*
- Comparisons of cost-effectiveness of various incentives and policies*
- Tuition incentives for teachers in high poverty, high-minority schools to complete content-area coursework**
- Preparation programs to train pre-service teachers to succeed in high poverty, high-minority schools**
- Retention programs to support and increase the skills of current teachers in high poverty, high-minority schools**
- Pathways to recruit qualified professionals to teach in high poverty, high-minority schools**
- Professional development programs**
- Tennessee Statewide System of Support services to districts and schools, including the System of Targeted Assistance Team (STAT), Achievement Gap Elimination (AGE), and Exemplary Educators (EE), District and School Appraisals, School Improvement Process, and Comprehensive System Planning Process**

* External resources that provide information on evidenced-based effective practices, such as those found on the Appalachia Regional Comprehensive toolkits and from ARCC staff assigned to assist TDE as well as in documents such as *The Distribution of Highly Qualified, Experienced Teachers: Challenges and Opportunities* (2009) from NCCTQ, are readily available to the TDE.

** Internal resources available from the Tennessee Department of Education.

C. Evidence for the Probable Success of the Strategies

All strategies included in this Teacher Equity Plan are drawn from comprehensive literature reviews of effective practices (primarily from the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality). Strategies centered on building human capital from sources such as the Strategic Management of Human Capital (SMHC) at the Consortium for Policy Research in Education, Wisconsin Center for Education Research (CPRE) were reviewed, and the recommendation for a human resources alignment assessment was included as an activity. The Tennessee projects continue to draw on the teacher effectiveness research of William Sanders and June Rivers.

All Tennessee schools will benefit from what is learned from both privately and publicly funded projects based on strategies with proven effectiveness at targeted sites, including the following:

- Memphis City Schools was awarded a Gates grant to reform its teacher recruitment, evaluation, development, retention, and dismissal processes to ensure that Memphis City Schools has the most effective teachers in its classrooms and that they are distributed equitably across schools
- Hamilton County Schools, where Chattanooga is located, uses teacher effect scores generated by Tennessee's Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) for differential recruitment, development, and retention of its most effective teachers through a public/private partnership known as the Benwood Foundation
- Knox County Schools participated in the Teacher Incentive Fund grant and implemented the Teacher Advanced Program (TAP) at pilot schools with positive results
- Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools partnered with the federally-funded Center for Performance Pay at Vanderbilt University to implement a vigorous research study on the use of performance pay to increase teachers' effectiveness as measured by student growth
- Tennessee Department of Education Pathways program recruits qualified professionals to teach in high poverty, high-minority schools
- The Tennessee Department of Education Teach Tennessee program trains teachers under the state's Transition to Teaching grant using strategies with proven effectiveness

D. SEA Plan to Examine the Issue of Equitable Teacher Assignment in Monitoring LEAs

According to the State's analysis of data related to teacher equity, the Department will prioritize specific technical assistance to LEAs that have either failed to meet their benchmarks for the percentage of core academic courses taught by highly qualified, highly effective teachers or have demonstrated large disparities in teacher characteristics between their high poverty and low poverty schools. The Tennessee Department of Education (TDE) will convene special professional development activities for the LEAs that have been identified. These activities will then be followed by regional and on-site technical assistance for the identified LEAs by the TDE.

Objective	Action Steps	Time Frame
Require LEAs that show inequities in teacher assignment to analyze their data to determine causes and develop specific steps to address gaps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify LEAs with most significant gaps • Train LEAs to analyze teacher distribution data and develop specific steps to address the gaps • LEAs analyze data and develop their teacher equity plan • LEAs submit their equity plan to the State for review and approval • LEAs review current data, evaluate effectiveness of strategies implemented, and revise their equity plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2010-2011; annually • 2010-2011; annually • 2010-2011; annually • 2010-2011; annually • 2010-2011; annually
Target specific intervention strategies for high priority schools with teacher equity gaps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify LEAs with most significant teacher equity gaps in high priority schools • Provide specialized training to assist identified LEAs with analyzing the teacher quality data in these high priority schools and identifying strategies that will attract and retain high quality teachers to their high priority schools • Require the LEAs to develop an analysis of the teaching staff of high priority schools compared with their other schools in the district • Require the LEAs to develop specific strategies to attract and retain their most highly effective teachers to these schools • Require the LEAs to submit annually to the State these specialized plans for high priority schools with their equity plans • Require the LEAs to gain state approval of their plans, including the use of available resources to implement the plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2010-2011; annually • 2010-2011; annually • 2010-2011; annually • 2010-2011; annually • 2010-2011; annually • 2010-2011; annually
Redirect the federal education resources in LEAs that have not reduced the gaps in teacher distribution and have high priority schools to target improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify LEAs that are not reducing the gap in teacher distribution and who also have high priority schools • Redirect their NCLB Consolidated Application funds and school improvement funds to target improvement in teacher quality in their high poverty schools and/or high priority schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2010-2011; annually • 2010-2011; annually